## TABLE II-9 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **MANAGEMENT ELEMENTS AND DECISION-MAKING CRITERIA AND CONSIDERATIONS** | | | | |
| **REVISED BOUNDARIES** | | | | |
| Not applicable. Boundaries included in Alternative 1 are those listed in the 1996 *Draft Yosemite Valley Housing Plan*. | Changes to the boundaries proposed under this alternative would expand the area for which management zoning is applied compared to Alternative 1.<br>Changes to the boundaries in and of themselves would have no effect on visitor experience, natural, cultural, and social resources, and ORVs. Rather, it is the application of management zoning that has the potential to affect visitor experience, natural, cultural, and social resources, and ORVs. | The boundaries would be the same as described in Alternative 1. | Changes to the boundaries proposed under Alternative 4 would expand the area for which management zoning is applied compared to Alternative 1.<br>Changes to the boundaries in combination with the application of restrictive management zoning would have beneficial and adverse effects on visitor experience, natural, cultural, and social resources, and ORVs. The change to the boundaries is discussed as appropriate under specific resource topics addressed for this alternative. | The boundaries would be the same as described in Alternative 4. |
| **REVISED CLASSIFICATIONS** | | | | |
| Not applicable. Classifications included in Alternative 1 are those listed in the 1996 *Draft Yosemite Valley Housing Plan*. | Changes to the classifications proposed under this alternative would have no effect on visitor experience, natural, cultural, and social resources, and associated ORVs.<br>Change in the classifications would not alter management or protection of the east Yosemite Valley or Wawona river segments. | The classifications would be the same as described in Alternative 1. | The classifications would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The classifications would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

## SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **REVISED OUTSTANDINGLY REMARKABLE VALUES** | | | | |
| Not applicable. Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORVs) included in Alternative 1 are those listed in the 1996 *Draft Yosemite Valley Housing Plan*. | Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORVs) listed in the 1996 *Draft Yosemite Valley Housing Plan* have been revised based on the application of new scientific information, changed conditions in the river corridor, and to accurately reflect ORVs criteria included in the Interagency Coordinating Council guidelines for implementation of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (refer to Appendix E for a history of the Outstandingly Remarkable Values).<br><br>Revision of the ORVs and removal of resources from the list of ORVs would not alter their management or protection. These resources would continue to be managed and protected by existing park policy and guidelines (e.g., *General Management Plan, Yosemite Resources Management Plan, Yosemite Vegetation Management Plan*), as well as by federal law (e.g., 1916 Organic Act, Federal Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act).<br><br>The revised ORVs provide increased focus on the Merced River over those presented in the 1996 *Draft Yosemite Valley Housing Plan*.<br><br>This management element is discussed as appropriate under specific resource topics addressed for this alternative. | The Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORVs) would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORVs) would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORVs) would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

# SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **SECTION 7 DETERMINATION PROCESS** | | | | |
| Not applicable. Although the National Park Service must comply with Section 7 of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act under Alternative 1, there would be no formal process for the determination. | The application of the consistent Section 7 determination process for water resources projects would provide a negligible, beneficial impact on visitor experience, natural, cultural, and social resources, and associated ORVs compared to Alternative 1 because management direction for future water resources would be provided.<br>This management element is discussed as appropriate under specific resource topics addressed for this alternative. | The Section 7 determination process would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The Section 7 determination process would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The Section 7 determination process would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |
| **MANAGEMENT ZONING** | | | | |
| Not applicable | Management zoning could have long-term, beneficial and adverse effects on visitor experience, natural, cultural, and social resources, and associated ORVs within the Merced River corridor.<br>This management element would limit the type of new facilities that could be built, would encourage the removal of inconsistent facilities, and would allow new development or redevelopment as appropriate.<br>This management element is discussed as appropriate under specific resource topics addressed for this alternative. | The general impacts associated with the use of management zoning would be the same as described in Alternative 2, although the application of management zoning would differ under this alternative. | The general impacts associated with the use of management zoning would be the same as described in Alternative 2, although the application of management zoning would differ under this alternative. | The general impacts associated with the use of management zoning would be the same as described in Alternative 2, although the application of management zoning would differ under this alternative. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

## SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **RIVER PROTECTION OVERLAY** | | | | |
| Not applicable | The River Protection Overlay could have long-term, beneficial and adverse effects on visitor experience, natural, cultural, and social resources, and associated ORVs within the Merced River corridor.<br><br>This management element would limit the type of new facilities that could be built, would minimize adverse effects of new facilities (e.g., bridges, roads) to ORVs and the free-flowing condition of the Merced River, and would encourage the removal of inconsistent facilities.<br><br>This management element is discussed as appropriate under specific resource topics addressed for this alternative. | The use of a River Protection Overlay would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The use of a River Protection Overlay would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | Not applicable. |
| **VISITOR EXPERIENCE AND RESOURCE PROTECTION FRAMEWORK** | | | | |
| Not applicable | Implementation of the Visitor Experience and Resource Protection (VERP) framework would have beneficial and adverse impacts on visitor experience, natural, cultural, and social resources, and associated ORVs.<br><br>The VERP framework protects both park resources and visitor experience, with particular focus on the ORVs, from impacts associated with visitor use, and helps managers address issues associated with visitor use.<br><br>This management element is discussed as appropriate under specific resource topics addressed for this alternative. | The implementation of the Visitor Experience and Resource Protection (VERP) framework would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The implementation of the Visitor Experience and Resource Protection (VERP) framework would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The implementation of the Visitor Experience and Resource Protection (VERP) framework would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

# SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **DECISION-MAKING CRITERIA AND CONSIDERATIONS** | | | | |
| Not applicable | For the duration of the *Merced River Plan*, Alternative 2 would provide a framework for decision-making on future management actions within the Merced River corridor.<br><br>This would be accomplished through the application of a consistent set of decision-making criteria and considerations composed of seven management elements: boundaries, classifications, updated ORVs, the Section 7 determination process, management zoning, the River Protection Overlay, and the VERP framework.<br><br>Compared to Alternative 1, which has no such management framework, this is considered to be a minor, beneficial impact for visitor experience, natural resources, cultural resources, social resources, and associated ORVs. | The framework for decision-making on future management actions would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The framework for decision-making on future management actions would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The framework for decision-making on future management actions would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

# SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **NATURAL RESOURCES** | | | | |
| **GEOLOGY, GEOHAZARDS, AND SOILS** | | | | |
| Considering the unpredictable and unavoidable nature of rockfalls and earthquakes and the history of their occurrence, there would be a long-term, adverse impact on public safety from geohazards.<br>Continued development under Alternative 1 would result in a long-term, adverse impact on soil resources, as future projects and visitor use would result in further compaction, erosion, and soil removal. | Considered collectively, the risks associated with rockfalls, seismic hazards, and impacts on soil resources, and the implementation of potential future actions in accordance with the management zones of Alternative 2 would result in a long-term, moderate, adverse impact. | Considered collectively, the risks associated with rockfalls, seismic hazards, and impacts to soil resources, and the implementation of potential future actions, in accordance with the management zones of Alternative 3, would result in a long-term, negligible, adverse impact compared to Alternative 1. | Considered collectively, the risks associated with rockfalls, seismic hazards, and impacts to soil resources, the implementation of potential future actions, in accordance with the management zones of Alternative 4, would result in a long-term, minor, beneficial impact compared to Alternative 1. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |
| Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects would have a long-term, adverse impact on public safety from rockfalls and earthquakes and a long-term, adverse impact on soil resources. | Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects would have a long-term, minor to moderate, adverse impact on public safety from rockfalls and earthquakes and a long-term, minor to moderate, adverse impact on soil resources. | Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects would have a long-term, minor, adverse impact on public safety from rockfalls and earthquakes and a long-term, minor, adverse impact on soil resources. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 3. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2, without the inclusion of the River Protection Overlay. |
| **HYDROLOGY, WATER QUALITY, AND FLOODPLAINS** | | | | |
| Under Alternative 1, the continued and potentially worsening substantial alterations of streamflow and floodplains would be a long-term, adverse impact, and the continued degradation of water quality would be a long-term, adverse impact. | For the duration of this plan, the use of a consistent set of decision-making criteria and considerations would have a moderate, beneficial, effect on flood hazards, hydrologic and geomorphic processes, and related ORVs within the river corridor because these management elements could preclude inappropriate development, remove inappropriate facilities from the immediate river corridor and floodplain, subject new actions to a rigorous planning process designed to eliminate adverse effects on the ORVs, limit human interaction with the river, and manage zones to their desired conditions. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2, without the inclusion of the River Protection Overlay.<br>In addition, floodplain protection and restoration would likely be indiscernible from management under the No Action Alternative. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

## SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **HYDROLOGY, WATER QUALITY, AND FLOODPLAINS (continued)** | | | | |
| Not applicable | Site-specific, short- and long-term, negative effects on hydrology, floodplains, and water quality could occur as the result of future actions that could be implemented under the proposed zoning.<br>Limits on the effects of visitor use and facilities in combination with the application of a consistent set of decision-making criteria and considerations would allow the hydrologic and geomorphic processes to remain relatively unimpaired and would direct restoration and enhancement of impaired functions. This would result in a long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on hydrologic processes and related ORVs within the river corridor. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | Site-specific, short- and long-term, negative effects on hydrology, floodplains, and water quality could occur as the result of future actions that could be implemented under the proposed zoning.<br>Limits on the effects of visitor use and facilities in combination with the application of a consistent set of decision-making criteria and considerations would allow the hydrologic and geomorphic processes to remain relatively unimpaired and would direct restoration and enhancement of impaired functions. This would result in a long-term, negligible, and beneficial impact on hydrologic processes and related ORVs within the river corridor. |
| Cumulative adverse effects associated with this alternative could be long-term and adverse. | Cumulative beneficial effects associated with this alternative could be long-term, minor, and beneficial. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | Cumulative beneficial effects associated with this alternative could be long-term, negligible, and beneficial. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

## SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **WETLANDS** | | | | |
| Visitor use and the projected increase in park visitors would continue to cause adverse effects, such as trampling, erosion, and compaction. | For the duration of this plan, the use of a consistent set of decision making criteria and considerations would have a moderate, beneficial, effect on wetland and wetland-related ORVs within the river corridor because these elements could preclude inappropriate development, remove inappropriate facilities from the immediate river corridor, subject new actions to a rigorous planning process designed to eliminate adverse effects on the ORVs, and manage zones to their desired conditions. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2, without the inclusion of the Rive r Protection Overlay. |
| In areas of little use, continued use of existing facilities at a similar level of intensity would have no noticeable effects on wetland and aquatic communities. | Site-specific short- and long-term negative effects to native wetland could occur as the result of future actions that could be implemented under the proposed zoning.<br>Limits on the effects of visitor use and facilities in combination with the application of a consistent set of decision making criteria and considerations would allow existing natural areas to remain relatively unimpaired with continued protection and would direct restoration and enhancement of impaired native habitats. This would result in a long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on native wetland and wetland-related ORVs within the river corridor. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | Site-specific short- and long-term negative affects to native wetland could occur as the result of future actions that could be implemented under the proposed zoning.<br>Limits on the effects of visitor use and facilities in combination with the application of a consistent set of decision-making criteria and considerations would allow existing natural areas to remain relatively unimpaired with continued protection and would direct restoration and enhancement of impaired native habitats. This would result in a long-term, moderate to major, beneficial impact on native wetland and wetland-related ORVs within the river corridor. | Site-specific short- and long-term negative effects to native wetland could occur as the result of future actions that could be implemented under the proposed zoning.<br>Limits on the effects of visitor use and facilities in combination with the application of a consistent set of decision-making criteria and considerations would allow existing natural areas to remain relatively unimpaired with continued protection and would direct restoration and enhancement of impaired native habitats. This would result in a long-term, minor, beneficial impact on native wetland and wetland-related ORVs within the river corridor. |
| Cumulative actions in combination with Alternative 1 could have a long-term, adverse effect on regional wetland patterns. | Cumulative actions in combination with Alternative 2 could have a long-term, major, adverse effect on regional wetland patterns. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

# SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **VEGETATION** | | | | |
| Visitor use and the projected increase in park visitors would continue to cause adverse effects such as trampling, erosion, and compaction. | For the duration of this plan, the use of a consistent set of decision making criteria and considerations would have a moderate, beneficial, effect on vegetation and vegetation-related ORVs within the river corridor because these elements could preclude inappropriate development, remove inappropriate facilities from the immediate river corridor, subject new actions to a rigorous planning process designed to eliminate adverse effects on the ORVs, and manage zones to their desired conditions. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2, without the inclusion of the River Protection Overlay. |
| In areas of little use, continued use of existing facilities at a similar level of intensity would have no perceptible effects on native vegetation. | Site-specific short- and long-term negative effects to native vegetation could occur as the result of future actions that could be implemented under the proposed zoning.<br>Limits on the effects of visitor use and facilities in combination with the application of a consistent set of decision-making criteria and considerations would allow existing natural areas to remain relatively unimpaired with continued protection and would direct restoration and enhancement of impaired native habitats. This would result in a long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on native vegetation and vegetation-related ORVs within the river corridor. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | Site-specific short- and long-term negative effects to native vegetation could occur as the result of future actions that could be implemented under the proposed zoning.<br>Limits on the effects of visitor use and facilities in combination with the application of a consistent set of decision-making criteria and considerations would allow existing natural areas to remain relatively unimpaired with continued protection and would direct restoration and enhancement of impaired native habitats. This would result in a long-term, moderate to major, beneficial impact on native vegetation and vegetation-related ORVs within the river corridor. | Site-specific short- and long-term negative effects to native vegetation could occur as the result of future actions that could be implemented under the proposed zoning.<br>Limits on the effects of visitor use and facilities in combination with the application of a consistent set of decision-making criteria and considerations would allow existing natural areas to remain relatively unimpaired with continued protection and would direct restoration and enhancement of impaired native habitats. This would result in a long-term, minor, beneficial impact on native vegetation and vegetation-related ORVs within the river corridor. |
| Cumulative actions in combination with Alternative 1 could have a long-term, adverse, cumulative effect on regional vegetation patterns. | Cumulative actions in combination with Alternative 2 could have a long-term, major, adverse effect on regional vegetation patterns. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

# SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **WILDLIFE** | | | | |
| Under Alternative 1 four basic adverse impacts would continue to occur and are expected to worsen over time. These include degradation in habitat quality for riparian and wet-meadow-dependent wildlife; loss of habitat connectivity and increase in habitat fragmentation; an increase in human-related disturbance, and continued stress on wildlife through factors such as the increasing presence of non-native species and disturbance-tolerant wildlife. | For the duration of this plan, the use of a consistent set of decision making criteria and considerations would have a moderate, beneficial, effect on wildlife and wildlife-related ORVs within the river corridor because these elements could preclude inappropriate development, remove inappropriate facilities from the immediate river corridor, subject new actions to a rigorous planning process designed to eliminate adverse effects on the ORVs, and manage zones to their desired conditions. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2.<br>In addition, although increased visitor use of areas outside of Yosemite Valley could have adverse effects (negligible to major and long-term, depending on-site specific conditions and the level and type of use), reducing the number of visitors to Yosemite Valley could have major, long-term, beneficial effects to wildlife throughout Yosemite Valley by reducing human-induced impacts. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2, without the inclusion of the River Protection Overlay. |
| Not applicable | Site-specific short- and long-term negative effects to native wildlife could occur as the result of future actions that could be implemented under the proposed zoning.<br>Limits on the effects of visitor use and facilities in combination with the application of a consistent set of decision-making criteria and considerations would allow existing natural areas to remain relatively unimpaired with continued protection and would direct restoration and enhancement of impaired native habitats. This would result in a long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on native wildlife and wildlife-related ORVs within the river corridor. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | Site-specific short- and long-term negative effects to native wildlife could occur as the result of future actions that could be implemented under the proposed zoning.<br>Limits on the effects of visitor use and facilities in combination with the application of a consistent set of decision making criteria and considerations would allow existing natural areas to remain relatively unimpaired with continued protection and would direct restoration and enhancement of impaired native habitats. This would result in a long-term, moderate to major, beneficial impact on native wildlife and wildlife-related ORVs within the river corridor. | The 3A and 3B zoning through a large portion of eastern Yosemite Valley would allow reconstruction of facilities to levels in place before the 1997 flood and construction of new facilities. New facilities / reconstruction of facilities could have major, long-term adverse effects on the abundance, diversity, and distribution of wildlife. Localized, minor, short-term, adverse effects on wildlife and wildlife habitat could occur from construction and demolition activities.<br>Application of Alternative 5 would have a long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on wildlife and wildlife-related ORVs within the river corridor compared to the No Action Alternative. |
| Although general effects associated with this alternative are beneficial, the overall cumulative effect would be adverse and long term. | Although general effects associated with this alternative are beneficial, the overall cumulative would be moderate, adverse, and long term. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

# SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **RARE, THREATENED, AND ENDANGERED SPECIES** | | | | |
| Effects to rare, threatened, and endangered species would be considered long-term and adverse. Effects could escalate as time passes and natural ecosystem patterns are not restored. | For the duration of this plan, the use of a consistent set of decision-making criteria and considerations would have a moderate, beneficial, effect on rare, threatened, and endangered species and related ORVs within the river corridor because these elements could preclude inappropriate development, remove inappropriate facilities from the immediate river corridor, subject new actions to a rigorous planning process designed to eliminate adverse effects on the ORVs, and manage zones to their desired conditions. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2, without the inclusion of the River Protection Overlay. |
| Not applicable | Site-specific short- and long-term negative effects to rare, threatened, and endangered species could occur as the result of future actions that could be implemented under the proposed zoning.<br><br>Limits on the effects of visitor use and facilities in combination with the application of a consistent set of decision-making criteria and considerations would allow existing natural areas to remain relatively unimpaired with continued protection and would direct restoration and enhancement of impaired native habitats. This would result in a long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on rare, threatened, and endangered species and related ORVs within the river corridor. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | Site-specific short- and long-term negative effects to rare, threatened, and endangered species could occur as the result of future actions that could be implemented under the proposed zoning.<br><br>Limits on the effects of visitor use and facilities in combination with the application of a consistent set of decision-making criteria and considerations would allow existing natural areas to remain relatively unimpaired with continued protection and would direct restoration and enhancement of impaired native habitats. This would result in a long-term, moderate to major, beneficial impact on rare, threatened, and endangered species and related ORVs within the river corridor. | Site-specific short- and long-term negative effects to rare, threatened, and endangered species could occur as the result of future actions that could be implemented under the proposed zoning.<br><br>Limits on the effects of visitor use and facilities in combination with the application of a consistent set of decision-making criteria and considerations would allow existing natural areas to remain relatively unimpaired with continued protection and would direct restoration and enhancement of impaired native habitats. This would result in a long-term, minor, beneficial impact on rare, threatened, and endangered species and related ORVs within the river corridor. |
| Cumulative actions could have a long-term, adverse effect on regional rare, threatened, and endangered species. | Cumulative actions could have a long-term, major, adverse effect on regional rare, threatened, and endangered species. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

## SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **AIR QUALITY** | | | | |
| With respect to ozone precursors, overall local emissions under Alternative 1 would follow the regional downward trend relative to existing conditions, which would represent a long-term, regional, beneficial effect.<br><br>With respect to particulate matter, overall local emissions under Alternative 1 could increase relative to existing conditions, resulting in a long-term, adverse effect, since that pollutant is more closely linked to overall vehicle-miles-traveled, which would increase, than to tailpipe exhaust emissions, which would decrease. | Application of the management zones for this alternative could result in short-term, local, minor, adverse effects associated with construction or demolition activities within the corridor. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |
| Not applicable | This alternative would accommodate development of a new transit center and/or day-visitor parking area facility, which could result in a long-term, local, moderate, beneficial effect due to reduced vehicle travel and related emissions in the eastern part of the Valley, but which would also result in a long-term, local, minor adverse effect in its immediate vicinity and in the vicinities of related facilities due to the increased concentration of vehicular activity and associated emissions at those locations. | The number of campsites could be reduced, which would result in a minor, local, beneficial effect by reducing the number of campfires and related emissions.<br><br>The number of day-visitor parking spaces could be reduced, which could result in a minor, local, adverse effect due to increased vehicular congestion and related emissions. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 3.<br><br>In addition, the potential reduction in the number of facilities for visitors within the Valley would likely reduce the number of visitors to the Valley itself, which would result in a moderate, long-term, beneficial effect within the Valley due to reduced vehicular activity and a negligible, long-term, beneficial effect on regional air quality as a whole. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2.<br><br>In addition, the management zoning designations would allow for an increase in the number of campsites in the Valley relative to the No Action Alternative, which could result in a local, minor, long-term, adverse effect by increasing the number of campfires and associated emissions.<br><br>Alternative 5 could also result in the relocation of certain administrative functions and employee housing from the Valley to the El Portal Administrative Site, which could have a local, minor, long-term, beneficial effect on air quality in the Valley by removing the associated vehicular activity from the Valley but which could also have a corresponding adverse effect in the El Portal Administrative Site area. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

## SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **AIR QUALITY (continued)** | | | | |
| The local, short-term, adverse, cumulative effects on air quality associated with construction activities would be due to the cumulative projects. | The local, short-term, adverse, cumulative effects on air quality due to construction activities could be reduced to a minor intensity with implementation of best management practices. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |
| Over the long-term, with respect to ozone, conditions in the corridor would be determined almost entirely by regional emissions trends rather than by local emissions sources under Alternative 1, and as discussed above, the long-term, regional effect would be beneficial, primarily due to the emissions reductions expected to occur with implementation of ongoing state and federal mobile-source control programs. | Over the long term, with respect to ozone, conditions in the corridor would be determined almost entirely by regional emissions trends rather than by local emissions sources under Alternative 2, and as discussed above, the long-term, regional effect would be moderate and beneficial, primarily due to the emissions reductions expected to occur with implementation of ongoing state and federal mobile-source control programs. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |
| With respect to particulate matter, conditions in the corridor would be determined by both regional sources and local sources and the relative influence of these two types of sources would vary on a daily and seasonal basis. | With respect to particulate matter, conditions in the corridor would be determined by both regional sources and local sources, and the relative influence of these two types of sources would vary on a daily and seasonal basis. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

## SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **NOISE** | | | | |
| Not applicable | Under Alternative 2, "natural quiet" would be removed from the list of ORVs along segments of the main stem of the Merced River and South Fork, but this action would have a local, negligible, long-term, adverse effect on noise. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |
| Alternative 1 would accommodate a gradual increase in annual visitation, which would lead to a local, long-term, adverse effect along the various roads that traverse the corridor in non-wilderness areas. | Alternative 2 would allow for the development of a transit center and/or day-visitor parking facility, which would result in a moderate, long-term, adverse noise effect in the vicinity of the facility itself. The transit center would also result in a long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial effect in the eastern portion of the Valley due to reduced vehicle trips and their related noise. | Alternative 3 would accommodate a gradual increase in annual visitation, which would lead to a local, minor, long-term, adverse effect along the various roads that traverse the corridor in non-wilderness areas. | Under Alternative 4, the potential reduction in the number of facilities for visitors within the Valley would likely reduce the number of visitors to the Valley itself, resulting in a local, moderate, long-term, beneficial effect on noise levels within the Valley due to reduced vehicular activity. | Alternative 5 would allow for the development of a transit center and/or day-visitor parking facility and relocation of certain administrative functions and employee housing from the Valley to the El Portal Administrative Site, which would result in a minor to moderate, long-term, adverse noise effect in the vicinity of the new or relocated facilities themselves, due to the concentration of vehicular activity and related noise, but would also result in a long-term, beneficial effect in the eastern portion of the Valley due to reduced vehicle trips and their related noise. The intensity of this potential, long-term, beneficial effect could be minor to moderate, depending upon the types of technology used to transport visitors within the Valley. |
| Not applicable | Under Alternative 2, construction or demolition activities could result in a moderate, short-term, adverse effect on noise levels within the corridor in the immediate vicinities of the construction or demolition sites. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

## SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **NOISE (continued)** | | | | |
| The local, short-term, adverse, cumulative effects on noise associated with construction activities would be due to cumulative projects. | Alternative 2 could contribute to the cumulative number of construction sites in and near the corridor resulting in a local, short-term, adverse effect on noise, which could be reduced to a moderate intensity with implementation of best management practices. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |
| Over the long term, in wilderness areas, the national trend in air travel would result in a local, long-term, adverse effect on the ambient noise environment.<br><br>In non-wilderness areas, the gradual increase in annual visitation to the park would likely offset the beneficial effects of those cumulative actions that would tend to reduce vehicle trips and their associated noise, resulting in a net, local, long-term, adverse effect on noise levels in those portions of the corridor through which roadways traverse. | Over the long term, in wilderness areas, the national trend in air travel would result in a local, minor, long-term, adverse, cumulative effect on the ambient noise environment.<br><br>In non-wilderness areas, the cumulative actions would result in a moderate, long-term, adverse effect on noise levels in the immediate vicinities of such facilities, but could result in a minor to moderate, long-term, beneficial effect in the eastern portion of the Valley due to reduced vehicle trips and related noise. | Over the long-term, in wilderness areas, the national trend in air travel would result in a local, minor, long-term, adverse effect on the ambient noise environment.<br><br>In non-wilderness areas, the gradual increase in annual visitation to the park would likely offset the beneficial effects of those cumulative actions that would tend to reduce vehicle trips and their associated noise, resulting in a net local, minor, long-term, adverse effect on noise levels. | Over the long term, in wilderness areas, the national trend in air travel would result in a local, minor, long-term, adverse effect on the ambient noise environment.<br><br>In non-wilderness areas, the cumulative actions that would tend to reduce motor vehicle trips, and the potential reduction in annual visitation to the Valley under this alternative could result in a moderate, long-term, beneficial effect on noise levels in the Valley due to reduced vehicle trips and related noise. | Over the long term, in wilderness areas, the national trend in air travel would result in a local, minor, long-term, adverse effect on the ambient noise environment.<br><br>In non-wilderness areas, the cumulative actions that would tend to reduce motor vehicle trips, and the potential development of a transit center and/or day-visitor parking facility (and, possibly, a related traffic check station) and relocation of certain administrative functions and employee housing from the Valley to the El Portal Administrative Site under this alternative would result in a moderate, long-term, adverse effect on noise levels in the immediate vicinities of new or relocated facilities, due to the concentration of vehicular activity, but could result in a minor to moderate, long-term, beneficial effect in the eastern portion of the Valley due to reduced vehicle trips and related noise, depending upon the type of technology used for transit purposes. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

# SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **CULTURAL RESOURCES** | | | | |
| **ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCES** | | | | |
| There would be no change in the treatment and management of archeological resources as a result of Alternative 1. | The implementation of potential future actions in accordance with the management zones of Alternative 2 would result in a long-term, major, adverse impact to archeological resources due to potential earthmoving activities. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |
| Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, adverse impact on archeological resources. | Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, major, adverse impact on archeological resources. | Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, minor to major, adverse impact on archeological resources. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 3. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |
| **ETHNOGRAPHICAL RESOURCES** | | | | |
| There would be no change in the treatment and management of ethnographic resources as a result of Alternative 1. | Alternative 2 would reduce the likelihood of impacts to ethnographic resources and would improve conditions for the recovery of traditionally used plants. This long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impact could be offset by the implementation of potential future actions that could occur under Alternative 2, which is considered to be a local, long-term, minor to major, adverse impact. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |
| Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, beneficial impact on ethnographic resources. | Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects would result in both a long-term, minor, beneficial impact on ethnographic resources (through the management of natural resources and river processes) and in a long-term, adverse impact on ethnographic resources (by damaging gathering sites or restricting access to traditional use places). | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

## SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **CULTURAL LANDSCAPE RESOURCES** | | | | |
| There would be no change in the treatment and management of cultural landscape resources as a result of Alternative 1. | Application of the zoning designations and River Protection Overlay could allow for the protection and/or enhancement of elements of the Yosemite Valley cultural landscape historic district. This would be a long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impact. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |
| Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects would result in a long-term, adverse impact on cultural landscape resources. | Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects would result in a long-term, minor to major, adverse impact on cultural landscape resources in Yosemite National Park because these projects would, individually and in combination, disrupt historical circulation and land use patterns, add noncontributing elements to the cultural landscape, result in removal of historic fabric or resources, or add incompatible facilities within or adjacent to a cultural landscape resource. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

## SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **VISITOR EXPERIENCE** | | | | |
| **RECREATION** | | | | |
| Under Alternative 1, availability and diversity of recreational opportunities in the river corridor would continue as presently managed. The river environment would continue to degrade, and this continuing degradation would have a long-term, adverse effect on recreational activities. | The implementation of potential future actions in accordance with the management zones of Alternative 2 is considered to be either a long-term, minor, beneficial impact or a long-term, negligible, adverse impact, depending on the viewpoint of the recreational user.<br>However, the availability and access to certain areas could be restricted, which would be a local, long-term, negligible, adverse impact. | The implementation of potential future actions in accordance with the management zones of Alternative 3 is considered to be either a long-term, minor, beneficial impact or adverse impact, depending on the viewpoint of the recreational user.<br>However, the availability and access to certain areas and activities could be restricted, which would be a local, long-term, minor, adverse impact. | Alternative 4 could have a regional, long-term, moderate, adverse impact on visitor experience as it relates to access to and availability of recreational opportunities, because of the potential for reduced access to the Valley for day visitors that could result from a reduction of day-visitor parking and from a reduction in intensity of use in the wide corridor in Yosemite Valley. | Alternative 5 could have a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on visitor experience as it relates to access to and availability of recreational opportunities, because of potential increased availability and continued accessibility of recreational opportunities in the river corridor. |
| Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, beneficial impact on recreation, because an increase in visitor access and an expansion of recreational opportunities would only be partially offset by the removal of specific recreational opportunities. | Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on recreation, because an increase in visitor access, an expansion of recreational opportunities, and improved quality of the natural environment would only be partially offset by the removal of specific recreational opportunities. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | Alternative 4 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, minor, adverse impact on recreation as it relates to access to and availability of recreational opportunities, because of the potential for reduced access to the Valley for day visitors that could result from a reduction of day-visitor parking and from a reduction in intensity of use in the wide corridor in Yosemite Valley pursuant to Alternative 4 management zoning. | Alternative 5 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on visitor experience as it relates to access to and availability of recreational opportunities. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

## SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **INTERPRETATION AND ORIENTATION** | | | | |
| The availability and diversity of interpretation and orientation programs and services would not change under Alternative 1. | Alternative 2 could have either a long-term, negligible to minor, adverse impact on interpretation and orientation in the river corridor (e.g., because the types and access to interpretation and orientation programs and services could be more limited and directed) or a long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impact (e.g., because access to a potentially relocated visitor center would be improved). | The ability of the National Park Service and its partners to continue offering the full range of interpretation programs for visitors could be restricted, and some programs could be eliminated.<br>Therefore, Alternative 3 could have a local, long-term, minor, adverse impact on visitor experience as it relates to access to and availability of interpretation and orientation programs and services. | Alternative 4 could have a local, long-term, moderate, adverse impact on visitor experience as it relates to access to and availability of interpretation and orientation programs and services. | Alternative 5 could have a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on visitor experience because access to interpretation and orientation programs and services could be expanded, particularly with a possible new visitor center in Yosemite Valley. |
| Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, beneficial impact because the availability and diversity of interpretation and orientation programs and services would increase. | Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on interpretation and orientation, because the beneficial impacts associated with an increase in programs and services would only be partially offset by programs and services being more limited and directed. | Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, negligible, adverse impact on interpretation and orientation, because programs and services would be more limited and directed to particular areas pursuant to Alternative 3, although this adverse impact would be partially offset by the beneficial impacts associated with an increase in interpretation and orientation programs and services associated with the cumulative projects. | Alternative 4 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, minor, adverse impact on interpretation and orientation, because there could be a substantial limit to the range and location of programs offered for the visitor in Yosemite Valley and Wawona, as well as limits on the number of visitors that could be served at any one time. | Alternative 5 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, minor, beneficial impact on interpretation and orientation, because the beneficial impacts associated with an increase in programs and services would only be partially offset by some programs and services being more limited and directed. |
| **VISITOR SERVICES** | | | | |
| Alternative 1 could perpetuate the inability to meet demand for camping and lodging. This is considered to be a potential long-term, adverse impact on the availability and diversity of visitor services. | Alternative 2 could have either a local, long-term, minor, beneficial or moderate, adverse impact on visitor services, depending upon implementation of potential future actions associated with potential changes in the availability of overnight accommodations. | Alternative 3 could have a local, long-term, moderate, adverse impact on visitor services due to possible reductions in overnight accommodations. | Actions taken under Alternative 4 could result in a local, long-term, moderate, adverse impact on access to and the availability of visitor services. | Various changes to access and availability of camping and lodging accommodations under Alternative 5 could result in a local, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on visitor experience as it relates to visitor services, because of the possible increase in camping and lodging accommodations in the Valley and in Wawona. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

# SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **VISITOR SERVICES (continued)** | | | | |
| Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, adverse impact on visitor services because of the potential reduction of camping and lodging opportunities in Yosemite Valley and the potential removal of the High Sierra Camps. This adverse impact would be partially offset by improving transportation to and from the park, rehabilitating and expanding some campgrounds in the park, and expanding lodging opportunities outside the park. | Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, minor, adverse impact on visitor services due to the reduction of camping and lodging opportunities. These adverse impacts would be partially offset by improving transportation to and from the park, rehabilitating and expanding some campgrounds in the park, and expanding lodging opportunities outside the park. | Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, moderate, adverse impact on visitor services due to the reduction of camping and lodging opportunities. These adverse impacts would be partially offset by improving transportation to and from the park, rehabilitating and expanding some campgrounds in the park, and expanding lodging opportunities outside the park. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 3. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |
| **WILDERNESS EXPERIENCE** | | | | |
| Alternative 1 would continue the current management practices for the wilderness area. Since the inability to meet demand for wilderness permits would continue, this is a long-term, adverse impact. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 1. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 1. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 1. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 1. |
| Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, beneficial impact to the wilderness experience, because the beneficial improvements to the wilderness ecosystem would offset the adverse removal of the High Sierra Camps. | Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, minor, beneficial impact to the wilderness experience, due to the beneficial improvements to the wilderness ecosystem. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

# SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **SOCIAL RESOURCES** | | | | |
| **LAND USE** | | | | |
| Since the basic land-use designation would not change, no impacts to land uses would occur as a result of Alternative 1. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 1. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 1. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 1. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 1. |
| Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in no net effect on land use, due to the fact that land uses would simply shift. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 1. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 1. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 1. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 1. |
| **TRANSPORTATION** | | | | |
| Increases in visitation during peak periods could occur, and congestion and delays would be a long-term, adverse impact on traffic conditions. Parking demand likely would exceed parking availability, which could trigger the need to implement the Restricted Access Plan on an increasing number of days during the peak season. This would have a long-term, adverse impact on traffic safety conditions by slightly increasing the potential for traffic safety hazards. | The implementation of potential future actions in accordance with the management zones of Alternative 2 is considered to be either a long-term, negligible, beneficial impact or a long-term, negligible, adverse impact, depending on whether an increase or a decrease in overnight accommodations within the river corridor occurred, whether a transit center and/or day-visitor parking facility were developed, and whether parking spaces within the 2B zone were removed. | The implementation of potential future actions in accordance with the management zoning and the River Protection Overlay of Alternative 3 is considered to be a long-term, moderate, adverse impact, because an increase in traffic congestion could result from the decrease in overnight accommodations and parking spaces within the river corridor, and from removal of vehicle bridges over the Merced River. | The implementation of potential future actions in accordance with the management zoning and the River Protection Overlay of Alternative 4 is considered to be a long-term, major, adverse impact because an increase in traffic congestion could result from the decrease in overnight accommodations and parking spaces within the river corridor, the inability to accommodate day-visitor parking demand, and from the removal of vehicle bridges over the Merced River. | The implementation of potential future actions in accordance with the management zoning of Alternative 5 is considered to be a long-term, negligible, beneficial impact, because the minor, beneficial impacts associated with an increase in overnight accommodations and the potential development of a transit center and/or day-visitor parking facility would be partially offset by the potential removal of parking spaces within the river corridor. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

# SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **TRANSPORTATION (continued)** | | | | |
| Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, adverse or beneficial impact on traffic and traffic safety conditions in Yosemite National Park, because the beneficial impacts associated with the cumulative projects would be offset by the adverse impacts associated with Alternative 1, including the potential increase in traffic congestion within Yosemite Valley and the potential increase in traffic safety hazards. | Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impact on traffic and traffic safety conditions in Yosemite National Park because these projects would encourage travel to the park by alternative modes and would manage traffic and parking to reduce congestion. | Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, minor, adverse impact on traffic and traffic safety conditions in Yosemite National Park, because the moderate, adverse impacts associated with Alternative 3 would partially be offset by the long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts associated with the cumulative projects. | Alternative 4 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, moderate, adverse impact on traffic and traffic safety conditions in Yosemite National Park, because the major, adverse impacts associated with Alternative 4 would be partially offset by the long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts associated with the cumulative projects. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |
| **SCENIC RESOURCES** | | | | |
| In the absence of a comprehensive planning effort to manage increased visitation and maintain and restore natural communities, Alternative 1 would have a local, long-term, adverse impact on scenic resources in developed and easily accessible areas. | Alternative 2 would have a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on scenic resources and scenic ORVs in Yosemite Valley and Wawona due to opportunities to restore degraded areas of the Merced River corridor. | Alternative 3 would have a local, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on scenic resources and scenic ORVs in Yosemite Valley due to opportunities to restore degraded areas of the Merced River corridor. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 3. | Alternative 5 would have a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on scenic resources and scenic ORVs in Yosemite Valley, designated Wilderness, the Merced River gorge, and Wawona due to opportunities to restore degraded areas of the Merced River corridor. |
| In designated Wilderness, use of overnight accommodation facilities would continue consistent with existing conditions, and scenic resources at these locations could remain somewhat impaired. | In designated Wilderness, the impacts would be negligible and beneficial. In the gorge and El Portal, this alternative would have a negligible, beneficial impact on scenic resources by maintaining the natural appearance of the gorge and due to the potential for restoration in El Portal. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. In addition, impacts to scenic resources would be minor and beneficial in Wawona. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 3. | In designated Wilderness, the impacts would be negligible and beneficial. In El Portal, this alternative would have a local, long-term, minor, adverse effect on the scenic character of the Merced River corridor due to the potential introduction of new development in El Portal. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

# SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **SCENIC RESOURCES (continued)** | | | | |
| Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in local, long-term, beneficial impacts on scenic resources in Yosemite Valley because of the overall emphasis on restoring disturbed or developed land to natural conditions, improving the health of ecosystems within or adjacent to the park, and reducing the number of vehicles traveling through the park. | Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in local, long-term, major, beneficial impacts on scenic resources in Yosemite Valley because of the overall emphasis on restoring disturbed or developed land to natural conditions. | Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in local, long-term, moderate, beneficial impacts on scenic resources in Yosemite Valley because of the overall emphasis on restoring disturbed or developed land to natural conditions. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 3. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |
| In designated Wilderness, the impacts would be long-term and beneficial. In some developed areas in Wawona and El Portal, Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects would result in local, long-term, adverse impacts to scenic resources due to visual intrusions in the scenic landscape from new facilities. | In designated Wilderness, the cumulative impacts would be minor and beneficial. In some developed areas in Wawona and El Portal, Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects would result in local, long-term, minor, adverse impacts to scenic resources due to visual intrusions into the scenic landscape from new development. | In designated Wilderness, the cumulative impacts would be minor and beneficial. In El Portal, Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects would result in local, long-term, negligible, adverse impacts to scenic resources due to visual intrusions in the scenic landscape from new facilities. In Wawona, impacts to scenic resources would be minor and beneficial, due to opportunities for restoration. | In designated Wilderness, the cumulative impacts would be minor and beneficial. In the gorge and El Portal, Alternative 4 and the cumulative projects would result in local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impacts to scenic resources by maintaining the natural appearance of the gorge, and due to the potential for restoration in El Portal. In Wawona, impacts to scenic resources would be minor and beneficial, due to opportunities for restoration. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

# SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **SOCIOECONOMICS**<br>**Social Environment** | | | | |
| Under Alternative 1, the lack of sufficient community recreational facilities would continue, and the crowded and communal housing conditions could worsen resulting in a local, long-term adverse environmental impact on the social environments of Yosemite Valley, El Portal, and Wawona. | The possible reduction or relocation of employee housing and associated effects on employee commutes would constitute a long-term, negligible, adverse impact on the local social environments of Yosemite Valley and Wawona.<br>The social environments in El Portal and Wawona would experience long-term, negligible to minor, adverse impacts associated with the potential strain on limited community amenities. | The social environment in El Portal would experience long-term, minor, adverse impacts associated the removal of housing in El Portal and the potential strain on limited community amenities.<br>The loss of Yellow Pine Campground and the relocation of employee housing and associated effects on employee commutes would be a long-term, negligible, adverse impact on the local social environments of Yosemite Valley and Wawona. | The social environments in El Portal and Wawona would experience long-term, minor, adverse impacts associated with the removal of housing in El Portal and Wawona, associated effects on employee commutes, and there would be limited impacts on community amenities from the potential relocation of displaced employee housing to El Portal.<br>The loss of volunteer camping at Yellow Pine would have a long-term, negligible, adverse impact on the local social environment of Yosemite Valley due to a reduction in volunteer housing in the Valley. | The possible reduction or relocation of employee housing and volunteer camping would constitute a long-term, negligible, adverse impact on the local social environments of Yosemite Valley, El Portal, and Wawona. Volunteer camping could be removed from Yosemite Valley resulting in the loss of a unique housing option in the Valley.<br>One government-owned employee residence could be relocated from Wawona and new volunteer camping could be introduced in Section 35, with negligible adverse impacts on employee commute and limited impacts to community amenities in Wawona. |
| Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a regional, long-term, beneficial impact by providing additional transportation options for employees and community residents. | Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a regional, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact by somewhat improving the commuting conditions. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |
| Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects would have a local, long-term, adverse effect on the social environments of Yosemite Valley, El Portal, and Wawona due to decreases in housing and social amenities near housing and increases in commuting time to Yosemite Valley, and substantial increases in housing in El Portal and Wawona. | Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects would have a local, long-term, moderate to major, adverse effect on the social environments of Yosemite Valley, El Portal, and Wawona due to decreases in housing and social amenities near housing and increases in commuting time in Yosemite Valley, and substantial increases in housing in El Portal and Wawona. | Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects would have a local, long-term, minor, adverse effect on the social environments of Yosemite Valley, El Portal, and Wawona due to decreases in housing and increases in commuting time in Yosemite Valley and Wawona, and a potential increase in housing in El Portal. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 3. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

# SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Visitor Populations** | | | | |
| Annual park visitation would increase over existing levels (primarily day users), and visitor spending would increase proportionately to the increase in visitation. There would be no impact on park overnighters, since the number of in-park accommodations would not change under Alternative 1. | Under Alternative 2, the number of overnight accommodations in the park could be maintained, reduced, or increased. Should the total number of in-park accommodations remain the same, the composition of the Yosemite visitor population would not differ from that under Alternative 1.<br>Should the total number of in-park accommodations decrease, there would be a local, long-term, minor, adverse impact on park overnight visitors.<br>Conversely, should the total number of in-park accommodations increase, there would be a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on overnight park visitors.<br>Alternative 2 would likely result in a long-term, minor, adverse impact on low-income visitors due to the potential decrease in campsites and Housekeeping Camp units.<br>Conversely, an increase in the total number of campsites under Alternative 2 would likely result in a long-term, minor, beneficial impact on low-income visitors. | Under Alternative 3, the number of overnight accommodations in the park could be maintained or reduced from that under Alternative 1. Should the total number of in-park accommodations remain the same, the composition of the Yosemite visitor population would not differ from that under Alternative 1.<br>Should the total number of in-park accommodations decrease, there would be a local, long-term, moderate, adverse impact on overnight park visitors.<br>Alternative 3 would likely have a long-term, minor to moderate, adverse effect on low-income populations due to reduced availability of inexpensive activities and a decrease in the total number of campsites and loss of the majority of the Housekeeping Camp units. | Under Alternative 4, the number of Yosemite visitors able to be accommodated would be reduced. The permanent decrease in park overnight accommodations and the potential displacement of day visitors from the Valley and possibly the park would constitute a long-term, major, adverse impact on overnight and day visitors.<br>Alternative 4 would likely have a long-term, moderate, adverse effect on low-income populations due to reduced availability of inexpensive activities and a decrease in the total number of campsites and loss of Housekeeping Camp units. | Under Alternative 5, the number of overnight accommodations in the park could increase from that under Alternative 1. An increase in the total number of in-park accommodations would have a local, long-term, moderate to major, beneficial impact on park overnight visitors.<br>Alternative 5 would likely result in a long-term, minor, beneficial impact on low-income visitors due to the potential increase in the number of available campsites. |
| Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a regional, long-term, beneficial impact on the visitor population by providing increased access for day visitors to the park. | Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a regional, long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impact on the visitor population by providing increased access for day visitors to the park. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

# SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Visitor Populations (continued)** | | | | |
| Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects would have a local, long-term, adverse impact on the visitor population due to the potential overall reduction in the number of lodging and camping units in the park. | Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects would have a local, long-term, moderate, adverse impact on the visitor population, including low-income visitors, due to the potential overall reduction in the number of lodging and camping units in the park. | Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects would have a local, long-term, moderate, adverse impact on the visitor population, including low-income visitors, due to a past reduction of accommodations in Yosemite Valley, the potential reduction in overnight accommodations due to the *Yosemite Valley Plan*, and the potential reduction in the number of lodging and camping units in the Merced River corridor pursuant to Alternative 3. | Alternative 4 and the cumulative projects would have a local, long-term, major, adverse impact on the visitor population, including low-income visitors, due to a past reduction of accommodations in Yosemite Valley, the potential reduction in overnight accommodations due to the *Yosemite Valley Plan*, and a decrease in park overnight accommodations and the potential displacement of day visitors from Yosemite Valley and possibly the park under Alternative 4. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |
| **Regional Economy** | | | | |
| The increase in park visitation (primarily during the current nonpeak periods) and proportionate increase in visitor spending would have a long-term, beneficial effect on the regional economy. | Under Alternative 2, the number of overnight accommodations in the park could be maintained, reduced, or increased.<br>Should the total number of in-park accommodations remain the same, visitor spending in the region would not be expected to differ from that under Alternative 1.<br>Should the total number of in-park accommodations decrease, Yosemite visitor spending would increase in the affected region, resulting in a long-term, negligible, beneficial effect on the regional economy.<br>Conversely, should the total number of in-park accommodations increase, Yosemite visitor spending would decrease in the affected region, resulting in a long-term, negligible, adverse effect on the regional economy. | Under Alternative 3, the number of overnight accommodations in the park could be maintained or reduced from that under Alternative 1. Should the total number of in-park accommodations remain the same, visitor spending in the region would not be expected to differ from that under Alternative 1.<br>Should the total number of in-park accommodations decrease, Yosemite visitor spending would increase in the affected region, resulting in a long-term, negligible, beneficial effect on the regional economy. | Under Alternative 4, potential substantial reductions in the number of visitors that would be accommodated at the park would result in a proportionate reduction in Yosemite visitor spending in the affected region. This would constitute a long-term, minor, adverse impact on the regional socioeconomic environment. | Under Alternative 5, the number of overnight accommodations in the park could increase from that under Alternative 1. Should the total number of in-park accommodations increase, Yosemite visitor spending would decrease in the affected region, resulting in a long-term, negligible, adverse effect on the regional economy. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

# SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Regional Economy (continued)** | | | | |
| Not applicable | Alternative 2 could result in shifts in regional employment, which would have a long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on the regional economy. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | Not applicable | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |
| Not applicable | Implementation of Alternative 2 could result in construction activity, which would have a short-term, negligible, beneficial impact on the regional economy. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |
| Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a short-term, beneficial impact on the regional economy due to project construction spending and employment. | Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a short-term, minor, beneficial impact on the regional economy due to project construction spending and employment. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |
| Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects would result in a long-term beneficial impact on the regional economy due to an increase in park visitation, increased regional output and employment from expanded National Park Service in-park operations, increased access for day visitors to the park, and increasing lodging revenues and transient occupancy taxes and providing sources of income and employment for area residents. | Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects would result in a long-term, minor, beneficial impact on the regional economy due to increased regional output and employment from expanded National Park Service in-park operations, increased access for day visitors to the park, and increasing lodging revenues and transient occupancy taxes. | Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects would result in a long-term, minor, beneficial impact on the regional economy due to increased visitor spending associated with Alternative 3, increased access for day visitors to the park, and increasing lodging revenues and transient occupancy taxes and providing sources of income and employment for area residents. | Alternative 4 and the cumulative projects would result in a long-term, negligible, adverse impact on the regional economy due to potential substantial reductions in the number of visitors that would be accommodated at the park and the resulting proportionate reduction in Yosemite visitor spending in the affected region associated with Alternative 4. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

## SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Concessioner** | | | | |
| Alternative 1 would have a local, long-term, beneficial effect on concessioner revenues due to a reduction in the "seasonality" of concession operations and increased visitor spending. | Potential removal of the Valley stable and a portion of Housekeeping Camp from the park would constitute a short-term, moderate, adverse impact on the primary park concessioner revenues. | Potential removal of several primary park concession facilities would constitute a short-term, major, adverse impact on primary park concessioner revenues. | Under Alternative 4, the reduction in the number of Yosemite visitors accommodated under this alternative and the potential removal of several primary park concession facilities would constitute a short-term, major, adverse impact to the primary park concession operations. | Under Alternative 5, increasing accommodations at Yosemite Lodge could constitute a short-term, major, beneficial impact to primary park concession operations. |
| Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, adverse impact on the primary park concessioner associated with locating new employee housing outside of the Valley, a decrease in annual concessioner profits, and possible closure of Merced Lake High Sierra Camp. | Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in a long-term, minor, adverse impact on the primary park concessioner associated with locating new employee housing outside of the Valley, a decrease annual concessioner profits, and possible closure of Merced Lake High Sierra Camp. | Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in short-term, major, adverse impacts associated with the possible removal of facilities in Alternative 3 of the *Merced River Plan/FEIS* and the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp. | Alternative 4 and the cumulative projects within and in the vicinity of Yosemite National Park would result in short-term, major, adverse impacts associated with the reduction in the number of Yosemite visitors accommodated under this alternative, the possible removal of facilities in Alternative 4 of the *Merced River Plan/FEIS*, and the possible closure of the Merced Lake High Sierra Camp to overnight lodging. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |

**TABLE II-9 (continued)**

## SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

| Alternative 1<br>NO ACTION | Alternative 2<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE/RIVER PROTECTION | Alternative 3<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, NARROW CORRIDOR | Alternative 4<br>RIVER PROTECTION EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR | Alternative 5<br>VISITOR EXPERIENCE EMPHASIS, WIDE CORRIDOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PARK OPERATIONS** | | | | |
| Long-term, adverse impacts to park operations and facilities as a result of Alternative 1 would be related to dispersed park operations, insufficient staffing levels, old or failing facilities, and increased visitation. | Implementation of VERP, in combination with other management elements proposed under Alternative 2, is anticipated to have moderate to major, short- and long-term, adverse impacts on park operations and facilities.<br>Impacts would be most pronounced in Yosemite Valley and El Portal, where visitor use is more concentrated, but would affect the entire corridor to some degree. | Implementation of VERP, in combination with other management elements proposed under Alternative 3, is anticipated to have moderate to major, short- and long-term, adverse impacts on park operations and facilities.<br>Impacts would be most pronounced in Yosemite Valley, where visitor use is more concentrated, but would affect the entire corridor to some degree. Visitation of Wawona, the gorge, and El Portal could increase if visitors were displaced from Yosemite Valley.<br>The effects on park operations and facilities would be directly related to the change in visitation and could result in long-term, minor to major, adverse effects. | Implementation of VERP in combination with other management elements proposed under Alternative 4, is anticipated to have moderate to major, short- and long-term, adverse impacts on park operations and facilities.<br>Short-term, adverse impacts would be most pronounced in Yosemite Valley, El Portal, and Wawona. Over the long term, decreased visitation and use of Yosemite Valley and a total reduction in the number of facilities would have a minor to moderate, beneficial effect on park operations and facilities. Visitation of Wawona, the gorge, and El Portal could increase if visitors were displaced from Yosemite Valley.<br>The effects on park operations and facilities would be directly related to the change in visitation and could result in long-term, minor to major, adverse effects. | Implementation of VERP, in combination with other management elements proposed under Alternative 5, is anticipated to have moderate to major, short- and long-term, adverse impacts on park operations and facilities. Impacts would be most pronounced in Yosemite Valley and El Portal, where visitor use is more concentrated, but would affect the entire corridor to some degree. |
| The combined effects of Alternative 1 with other cumulative projects would result in a long-term, adverse impact on park operations and facilities because of the increased demand on park operations services and facilities resulting from these projects. | The combined effects of Alternative 2 with other cumulative projects would result in a long-term, major, adverse impact on park operations and facilities because of the increased demand on park operations services and facilities resulting from these projects. | The combined effects of Alternative 3 with other cumulative projects would result in a long-term, moderate to major, adverse impact on park operations and facilities because of the increased demand on park operations services and facilities resulting from these projects. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 3. | The impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2. |